Phone: 360-473-2345 Fax: 360-473-5161

1		p
2		0
3		S
4		S
5	***************************************	F
6		
7		0
8		C
9		tl
0		K
1	-	o
12		S
13		
14		p
15		
6		n
17	-	f
18		E
9		С
20		ti
21		is
22		J
23	-	a
24		
25		İI

property is being used as an illegal junkyard and in violation of City Codes and previous orders issued in Kitsap County Superior Court Cause No. 97-2-01748-5 ("Sesko I"). Id. Sesko I, which is still in litigation, has been litigated in the trial and appellate courts for several years. See City of Bremerton v. Sesko, 2006 WL 2329467 (Wash.App.Div.2). On February 13, 2008, this Court entered a Memorandum of Opinion in Sesko I after a trial on the only remaining issue. Koontz Declaration, Exhibit B ("Memorandum of Opinion"). Ms. Sesko appealed the judgment based on the Memorandum of Opinion to the Court of Appeals, and on July 1, 2008 the Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal. Koontz Declaration, Exhibit C ("Order Denying Appellants' Motion to Allow Late Filing of a Notice of Appeal"). On July 31, 2008 Ms. Sesko filed a Petition for Review with the Supreme Court seeking review of the Court of Appeals' dismissal. Koontz Declaration.

In the case at bar ("Sesko II") the primary issue is the condition of Ms. Sesko's property. See Complaint. In order to determine the condition of her property, the City needs to have access to her property. In November 2007 the City began informal requests for an inspection of the property at a time convenient for all parties. Koontz Declaration, Exhibit D. Due to vacation and trial schedules, the parties were unable to agree on a convenient time in 2007. On January 24, 2008, the City again requested a convenient time for an inspection. Koontz Declaration, Exhibit E. The parties did not resolve this issue in part because they were preparing for the hearing in Sesko I, which took place January 29 through February 1, 2008. Koontz Declaration. The appellate filings, motions and petitions in Sesko I took precedence over discovery in Sesko II. Id. After the City's inspection of Ms. Sesko's property has been completed, the City anticipates additional

City's Motion to Continue Trial Date - 2

26

discovery in the form of depositions, interrogatories, requests for production, and retaining experts. *Id*.

The discovery cutoff in *Sesko II* is October 13, 2008. Koontz Declaration, Exhibit F ("Case Event Schedule"). The trial date is February 9, 2009. *Id.* While the parties have attempted to engage in discovery since November 2007, the litigation in *Sesko I* has taken precedence and no discovery has been completed. Koontz Declaration. The City believes that in order for the parties to complete discovery and be prepared for trial, the trial date should be continued to the summer of 2009 and the other case events should also be moved consistent with local rules. *Id.*

III. STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Whether the Court should grant the City's motion to continue the trial date when there is good cause for doing so, specifically, that the parties likely will not be able to complete discovery prior to the discovery cutoff and that the parties likely will not be prepared for trial on the current trial date.

IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON

- A. The Pleadings filed herein;
- B. Declaration of Mark E. Koontz, with Exhibits:
 - 1. Complaint (Exhibit A);
 - 2. Memorandum of Opinion in Cause No. 97-2-01748-5 (Exhibit B);
 - Order Denying Appellants' Motion to Allow Late Filing of a Notice of Appeal in Court of Appeals Division II Case No. 37574-5-II (Exhibit C);
 - Emails between City's counsel and Ms. Sesko's counsel in November 2007
 (Exhibit D);

City's Motion to Continue Trial Date - 3

- 5. Email from City's counsel to Ms. Sesko's counsel dated January 24, 2008 (Exhibit E); and
- 6. Order Setting Trial Date and Civil Case Event Schedule (Exhibit F).

V. AUTHORITY

KCLCR 40(b)(6)(A)(iv) authorizes this Court to amend any date set out in the Order Setting Trial Date and Civil Case Event Schedule upon a showing of good cause by any party:

Upon motion of any party or the court, and upon good cause shown, the preassigned judge may modify any date in the original Order Setting Trial Date and Civil Case Event Schedule.

KCLCR 40(b)(6)(A)(iv).

In our case, the City has shown good cause for a continuance of the trial date and the other case events. Since January 2008, the parties have been actively engaged in litigating Sesko I in this Court, in the Court of Appeals, and now in the Supreme Court. The efforts involved in Sesko I have kept the parties from engaging in discovery in Sesko II. Currently, counsel for the City is available for trial any date in July or August 2009. If the trial date is continued to July or August 2009 and the other case events are set pursuant to KCLCR 40(b)(6)(A)(vi), the parties should be able to complete discovery and be prepared for trial.

VI. CONCLUSION

There is good cause for continuing the trial date and other case events in the Order Setting Trial Date and Civil Case Event Schedule. Therefore, this Court should grant the City's motion and continue the trial date to a date convenient for the Court in July or August 2009.

City's Motion to Continue Trial Date - 4

ROGER A. LUBOVICH BREMERTON CITY ATTORNEY 345 6th Street, Suite 600, Bremerton, Washington 98337 Phone: 360-473-2345 Fax: 360-473-5161

DATED this 14th day of August, 2008. ROGER A. LUBOVICH Bremerton City Attorney Mark E. Koontz, WSBA # 26212 Attorney for Plaintiff

City's Motion to Continue Trial Date - 5

ROGER A. LUBOVICH